O

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

BRANDY LEA RUDDER,

v.

SHERRI PRICE, et al.,

Plaintiff,

Case No. C24-0753-RAJ-SKV

ORDER

Defendants.

Plaintiff is a state prisoner who is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action. *See* Dkt. 6. On July 22, 2024, the Court entered a Report and Recommendation recommending this matter be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Dkt. 8. Plaintiff recently filed two motions in which she requests that the filing fee for this action be waived, delayed, reduced, or dismissed. *See* Dkt. 9 at 1-2; Dkt. 10 at 1-2. Plaintiff indicates that she has four civil suits pending and that the 20 percent of her monthly income being taken from her prison account each month for each case presents a hardship as it does not leave her sufficient funds to buy hygiene items, envelopes, and food necessary to accommodate her special diet. *See id.* She asks to be allowed to pay only \$5.00 per case each month or, in the alternative, to be allowed to pay only 5 percent per case for a *total* of 20 percent of her monthly income each month. *See id.*

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), the Court may authorize the commencement of an action without the prepayment of fees. However, when a prisoner plaintiff is granted leave to proceed without the prepayment of fees, he or she is still required to pay the full amount of the filing fee. Proceeding *in forma pauperis* simply permits a prisoner plaintiff to pay the filing fee over time rather than up front. *See* § 1915(b). As a part of her *in forma pauperis* application, Plaintiff signed an Acknowledgement and Authorization form which makes clear that she is responsible for payment of the full filing fee under § 1915, and that she is required to make monthly payments equal to 20 percent of her preceding month's income until the filing fee is paid in full. *See* Dkt. 4 at 3. The *in forma pauperis* statute requires such payments and contains no exceptions that would permit their waiver or reduction. *See* § 1915(b)(2). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motions to amend repayment of her filing fee, Dkts. 9 & 10, must be denied.

Dated this 5th day of September, 2024.

S. KATE VAUGHAN

United States Magistrate Judge